



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

small discrepancies between the best modern determinations of the constant.

E. H. KENNARD

PHYSICAL LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRAVITATION AND ELECTRICAL ACTION

IN a recent number of *SCIENCE*¹ Professor F. E. Nipher has pointed out that the force exerted between two isolated solid spheres depends not only upon their mutual gravitational attraction, but also upon the electrostatic charges carried upon their surfaces, and suggests that this fact has been ignored in determinations of the gravitational constant by experimenters from Cavendish to Boys. The fact that the potential of the earth relative to points infinitely remote is not necessarily zero, and the further fact that the earth's surface may at a given time and place be heavily charged owing to volume changes in the atmosphere are urged to show that the spheres employed in the experiments referred to may have carried appreciable charges.

That Professor Nipher's expression for the electrostatic force between two charged spheres is applicable only to the case in which the distance between their centers is great compared with the radius of the larger is perhaps of little importance in view of the fact that the torsional systems in all experiments on the gravitational constant have been effectively shielded from electrostatic action. The important condition is, of course, that displacements of the torsional system shall not alter the electrostatic capacity of the earth, or of the earth-atmosphere condenser, and this condition is satisfied when the system is surrounded by a conducting casing. In Boys' experiment the torsional system was enclosed in a double metal casing and the apparatus was installed in an underground vault.

It does not seem impossible that contact differences of potential between the parts of the torsional system and the casing may have affected results in some of the experiments, although in Boys' experiment the symmetry of the apparatus was such that forces arising from contact differences of potential could

have exerted only inappreciable torques on the suspended system.

There would seem to be little reason for thinking that the gravitational constant is not known to within one part in 3,000, Professor Boys' estimate.

C. DAVISSON
CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
PITTSBURGH, PA.

AMBYSTOMA NOT AMBLYSTOMA

IN view of the recent difficulty I have experienced in trying to have the generic name of the spotted salamander spelled *Ambystoma* as originally written by Tschudi, it seems desirable to call attention to the correct form of the word. In reporting the exhibition of a specimen of this salamander before the Biological Society of Washington I took pains to see that the word was correctly spelled in manuscript. The report has appeared in print twice and in each instance an *l* has been inserted by the publisher.¹

The word was proposed by Tschudi² in 1839 and written by him *Ambystoma* in four different places in his work, and only in that manner. The derivation of the word is not given by him and there is nothing to indicate that he intended *Amblystoma* and made a lapsus calami. The first author to employ *Amblystoma* was Agassiz³ in 1842-1846. This spelling has had a very wide acceptance and it is the one usually employed by morphologists, embryologists, physiologists and others who are not systematists. A discussion of the appropriateness of *Ambystoma* and its possible derivation from *ἀνὰ στόμα βίβω* meaning to cram into the mouth is given by Stejneger in his "Herpetology of Japan."⁴ The correct form of the word is employed by Hegner⁵ in his "College Zoology," but aside from this most of the non-specialist authors that I have lately seen incorrectly spell the word with the *l* inserted.

¹ *Jour. Wash. Acad. Sci.*, Vol. 6, p. 258, May 4, 1916. *SCIENCE*, N. S., Vol. 43, p. 761, May 26, 1916.

² *Mém. Soc. Sci. Nat. Neuchatel*, Vol. 2, section 4, pp. 57 and 92, 1839.

³ *Nomencl. Zool. Rept.*, p. 2, 1842-46.

⁴ *Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus.*, No. 85, p. 24, July 22, 1907.

⁵ "College Zoology," p. 511, 1912.

¹ March 31, 1916, page 472.